

## **REMARKS**

This amendment responds to the office action mailed December 16, 2002.

Claims 1-4, 10, 13-17, 28, 31, 34, 35, 37, 72, 74, 76, 83 and 84 were pending in the instant Application. With the instant amendment, Applicants have canceled Claims 1-4, 10, 13-17, 28, 31, 34, 35, 37, 72, 74, 76, 83 and 84, without prejudice, and added new Claims 218-268. Applicants expressly reserve the right to pursue any canceled subject matter in one or more related, continuation, divisional or continuation-in-part application(s). Support for new Claims 218-268 can be found in the specification at, *inter alia*, pages 27-34, 69-72, 248-268 and Claims 165-217 as originally filed. As the claims are fully supported by the specification and claims as originally filed, they do not constitute new matter. Applicants hereby request entry of the claims into the record. Applicants submit that claims 218-268 satisfy all the criteria for patentability and are in condition for allowance. An early indication of the same and passage of claims 218-268 to issuance is therefore kindly solicited.

### **I. THE REJECTIONS UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN**

Claims 1-4, 10, 13-17, 28, 31, 34, 35, 37, 72, 74 and 83 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 1-3, 13-17, 30, 37, 38, 40, 45, 70 and 71 of U.S. Patent No. 5,837,464. Further, Claims 1, 14, 28, 34, 35, 37, 72, 74, 83 and 84 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 24, and 26 of U.S. Patent No. 5,837,464. At the outset, as pointed out, above, none of Claims 1-4, 10, 13-17, 28, 31, 34, 35, 37, 72, 74, 76, 83 and 84 is currently pending. However, to the extent the Examiner contends one or both of these rejections would apply to the newly added claims, Applicants assert that the pending claims are patentably distinct from those of U.S. Patent No. 5,837,464.

### **II. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH (ENABLEMENT), SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN**

Claims 1-4, 10, 13-17, 28, 31, 34, 35, 37, 72, 74, 76, 83 and 84 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly being not enabled. As pointed out, above, none of Claims 1-4, 10, 13-17, 28, 31, 34, 35, 37, 72, 74, 76, 83 and 84 is currently pending. However, for the reasons set forth below, Applicants assert that the pending claims are fully enabled under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The PTO bases its rejection of Claims 1-4, 10, 13-17, 28, 31, 34, 35, 37, 72, 74, 76, 83 and 84 on the contention that they do not recite a functional connection between the patient-derived segment and the indicator gene. (Office Action, p. 3).

New Claims 218-268 are fully enabled by the specification as originally filed and merely clarify that which Applicants have always considered the claimed subject matter. In particular, in the methods recited in each of the claims there is explicitly pointed out the functional connection between the patient-derived segment and the indicator gene: the indicator gene expression is dependent upon the patient-derived segment. As such, the above-summarized concern with respect to Claims 1-4, 10, 13-17, 28, 31, 34, 35, 37, 72, 74, 76, 83 and 84 is not relevant to the enablement of the subject matter recited in the pending claims.

### **III. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH (WRITTEN DESCRIPTION), SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN**

Claims 1-4, 10, 13-17, 28, 31, 34, 35, 37, 72, 74, 76, 83 and 84 have been rejected as allegedly containing subject matter which is not described in the specification sufficiently to convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors had possession of the full scope of the claimed invention at the time of filing the application. As pointed out, above, none of Claims 1-4, 10, 13-17, 28, 31, 34, 35, 37, 72, 74, 76, 83 and 84 is currently pending. However, for the reasons set forth below, Applicants assert that the subject matter of the pending claims is described in the specification sufficiently to convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors had possession of the full scope of the claimed invention at the time of filing the application.

The PTO bases its rejection of Claims 1-4, 10, 13-17, 28, 31, 34, 35, 37, 72, 74, 76, 83 and 84 on the contention that “[t]he genus of viruses encompassed by the instant claims is vast, including at least all pathogenic viruses.” (Office Action, p. 4).

The subject matter of new Claims 218-268 is described in the specification sufficiently to convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors had possession of the full scope of the claimed invention at the time of filing the application. In particular, new Claims 218-235 and 249-268 are directed to subject matters relating to Human Cytomegalovirus (HCMV) and new Claims 236-248 are directed to subject matters relating to betaherpesvirinae, of which HCMV is an important member. The subject matter of new Claims 218-268 can be found in the specification at, *inter alia*, pages 27-34, 69-72, 248-268

and Claims 165-217 as originally filed. As such, the above-summarized concern with respect to Claims 1-4, 10, 13-17, 28, 31, 34, 35, 37, 72, 74, 76, 83 and 84 is not relevant to the description in the specification of the subject matter recited in the pending claims.

#### CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 218-268 satisfy all the criteria for patentability and are in condition for allowance. Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance and solicit an early passage of Claims 218-268 to issuance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.136(a)(3), the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge all required fees, including fees under 37 CFR § 1.17 and all required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment, to Pennie & Edmonds, LLP U.S. Deposit Account No. 16-1150 (order no. 11068-051-999).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 16, 2003

  
Nikolaos C. George 39.201  
(Reg. No.)

**PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP**  
1155 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036-2711  
(212) 790-9090